



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

It is a pleasure to note that two or three of the speeches made in support of the President's policy were really of a high order. That of Mr. Hitt, Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, was an able and judicious statement and defense of the Administration's position. So was that of Mr. Johnson of Indiana, who in his speeches oftener perhaps than any other man in the House gets beyond the range of mere politics and addresses himself to the questions in hand from the standpoint of principle, political morality and genuine patriotism.

As to Cuba itself, the recent riots have shown clearly how complex and difficult the whole problem is from every point of view. Nobody believes that peace and order could long be maintained under Spanish rule. How is autonomy, even if established, to do anything for the island, since not only the independents are firmly opposed to it but also the loyalists, who brought on the recent riots on purpose to defeat the efforts of the Sagasta ministry to make Cuba a self-governing colony? If the island were declared independent, one can well imagine the state of confusion and bloodshed which would continue because of the quarrels of the three parties into which the inhabitants are divided. Under these circumstances, what solution of the dreadful situation is there to offer? There is certainly none which can be imposed from without. The situation is such that, though dreadful beyond utterance, it must be allowed to solve itself from within. That is the only thing possible, it seems to us, and our country will show itself wise if it continues to hold itself aloof, except so far as it can aid by pacific means, and to await the developments which time shall bring. In this way its example will ultimately be worth much more to Spain, to Cuba and to the rest of the world than any violent interference could possibly be.

### **The Immigration Problem.**

On a superficial consideration of the subject, there seems to be much to be said in favor of the further restriction of immigration. A close analysis of it, both theoretically and historically, leads inevitably, it seems to us, to the conclusion that the manner in which the Lodge bill, already passed by the Senate, proposes to deal with the difficulty is both wrong in principle and sure to fail in practice.

The measure proposes to protect the purity of

American suffrage by keeping out undesirable foreigners. The present immigration laws are as sufficient to keep out such persons, as any that might be enacted, if they were faithfully administered, not in a slavish literal way, but according to their real spirit and purpose. These laws are very vexatious as they exist. There is not another country in the world, probably, which gives as many annoyances to those coming to its shores as ours now does. The laws are found to be so burdensome and difficult of execution in practice that oftentimes the only way to get on with them is to ignore them. Does any one suppose it would be different under the Lodge measure? Some way would be found of having otherwise desirable immigrants read twenty-five words of the Constitution, though they were incapable of actually doing so. The measure proposes to send whole families back; if the head of the family can not read. Suppose a family of five should arrive. The mother can read well. So can a son of nineteen and a daughter of sixteen. They are all bright and promising. The "old man" is upright and industrious. There are but few officers of the law who would not in such a case find some way of having him read twenty-five words before twenty-four hours.

Even if the law were strictly executed, the tendency would be to fix attention on the reading qualification and to neglect others. In this way undesirable immigrants who could read,—and there are many of them,—would be more likely to get in than they are now.

The measure is really a measure to restrict immigration, on the ground that we do not need any further additions to our population from abroad, that we are already crowded almost to the suffocation point. Do not the advocates of the measure know that the whole seventy millions of our population, if put into the single state of Texas, would not make so dense a population as that of Massachusetts, and that four hundred millions in the whole country would give us only half as many to the square mile as the Bay State, not a very fertile state, has? There are few people that have ever pictured to themselves the vastness of the undeveloped sections of our country, waiting for millions of people whom we can not yet put into them. There is plenty of room for all the honest and industrious families that, under unrestricted immigration, would come to our shores for the next fifty or one hundred years, and

we ought to welcome them whether or not they can "read *and* write" or "read *or* write." By the reading test, if it could be carried out, we should shut out a very large number of people, who would be useful to us in developing these regions; we should at the same time let in most of the scoundrels, who can both "read *or* write" and "read *and* write."

If a real statesman, who understood American principles, American interests and American duty to civilization, were in charge of the immigration matter in the Senate he would take an entirely different course from the one now being pursued, or drop the subject altogether. The immigration problem is very little one of entrance; it is almost wholly one of distribution. This problem of distribution has, strange to say, never been tackled at all, at least not in any large way. The immigration problem can never be solved, under any number or kind of restriction laws, until that of distribution is seriously treated by the general government in coöperation with the States—both the sea-board States and the thinly settled ones beyond the Mississippi. Large sums of money might very profitably be spent in this direction, and there is some constitutional way of doing it.

The pending measure misses the real difficulty as to the purity of the suffrage. The problem, here, is not one of entrance, it is one of naturalization. In naturalization the road to citizenship might well be made both longer and steeper than it is. But even here the dangers to the suffrage from the foreign-born are, in our judgment, exaggerated. The suffrage has never been, on the whole, purer than it is to-day. The chief dangers to it, too, come not from the immigrants themselves, but from the selfish, unscrupulous American demagogues who "rush" them into citizenship for the sake of having their votes to manipulate. So long as American politicians of this base type continue, the increased purity to the ballot arising from the capacity to read "twenty-five words" would be inappreciable. It is even probable that the "little learning" would make them easier to manage.

One of the most serious objections to further attempts to restrict immigration is the utter impossibility of carrying out such measures to any effective extent. In the present state of international association, with the ever increasing means of rapid, worldwide travel, it is certain that people will travel,

trade, work and live largely where they please. If they can not get into a country in one way, they will in another. Our experiences with the Chinese ought to convince us once for all of the utter futility of all efforts to check the natural flow of the currents of our present world-society. The Chinese exclusion laws are now confessed, by all who know the facts, to be a dead failure. Shut off from the natural ports, the Chinese have got into Canada and Mexico and crossed over the long border lines practically at their will. It is thought by those most conversant with the subject that the influx from China has even been stimulated and increased by the restriction.

We shall have the same experience with European immigrants, if the Lodge measure goes into effect. If it should prove efficient in keeping any large number out at the regular landing ports, as it most certainly will not, those in Europe desiring to make their home in the United States will find their way in through Canada and Mexico. The route is only a little longer, and the long border can not be guarded against them. Only absolute exclusion, which the nation would never think of attempting, would be efficient. Even this would not keep out those having a racial resemblance to our present inhabitants, among whom are found practically all races.

If the proposed measure becomes law and an attempt is made to carry it out, it will prove a ridiculous and humiliating failure. It will multiply annoyances and hardships to those desirable immigrants seeking a home and an improvement of their condition in our country. It will do nothing for the purity of our suffrage. It will create friction and produce increasing dislike for us abroad. It will lessen confidence in our profession of love of liberty and of the general weal of humanity. It will give the lie to the high principles of our national life and run square into the face of our best traditions on the subject.

The problem, or problems, thus sought to be solved, will have to be approached from an altogether different standpoint. They can be solved only by the faithful, persistent application of spiritual, moral and educational means here within our own dominion. Our wisdom and our success lie in this direction. The ends of the earth are upon us, and we can not get rid of them. The short cut of attempted exclusion will prove a humiliating, expen-

sive and endless road, and will bring no honor either to the nation or to those whose shortsighted patriotism finds vent in schemes which are essentially un-American.

### Editorial Notes.

On the fourteenth of January the President submitted to Congress the awards and report of the Commission appointed under the treaty of 1896 to determine the amount of damages to be paid to British subjects on account of the seizure of their sealing vessels in Behring Sea. In submitting the report the president recommended "prompt and favorable action by Congress to the end that these long pending questions may be finally and satisfactorily terminated." The amount of the claims allowed on account of twenty-two vessels was \$264,188.91. Interest on this amounted to \$149,790.86. Fourteen personal claims were allowed, amounting to \$49,475. Two further claims, originally thrown out but finally considered, amounting to \$9,696.99, were allowed. The whole amount allowed, therefore, was, with interest, \$473,151.26. This amount differs slightly from that given in the telegraphic reports, which was noted in our last issue. The treaty of 1896, under which the Commission was appointed, requires that an appropriation to pay these awards be made within six months.

The following statement from Ex-President Cleveland has been called out by remarks of Senator Morgan in the Senate representing that the ex-President was in favor of the annexation of Hawaii:

"I do not believe in discussing matters of this kind as a private citizen. I do not care, however, to be misrepresented. I will, therefore, say that ever since the question of Hawaiian annexation was presented I have been utterly and constantly opposed to it. The first thing I did after my inauguration in March, 1893, was to recall from the federal Senate an annexation treaty then pending before that body. I regarded, and still regard, the proposed annexation of these islands as not only opposed to our national policy, but as a perversion of our national mission.

"The mission of our nation is to build up and make a greater country out of what we already have, instead of annexing islands. I did not suppose that there was anyone in public life who misunderstood my position on this matter. It had been said that I was partial to the former Hawaiian monarchy, and desired to see it restored, in order that I might treat with it for the purpose of annexation. How could I have any such an idea if I regarded annexation as contrary to our national policy.

"The same answer can be made to the statement that my opposition to Hawaiian annexation was based merely upon dissatisfaction with the treaty pending before the Senate at the time of my second inauguration. I was opposed to annexation as such.

"In regard to the Hawaiian monarchy, aside from any question of annexation and without harboring any previ-

ous designs of restoring that monarchy, I investigated the relations of our representatives to its overthrow. This investigation satisfied me that our interference in the revolution of 1893 was disgraceful. I would gladly, therefore, for the sake of our national honor and our country's fair name, have repaired that wrong.

"In regard to the Cuban question: My position was fully made known to Congress in the various messages in which the subject was discussed. I was opposed to the recognition of the belligerency of the island, and my position was perfectly well known. Indeed, so unmistakable were my views on the subject that I was time and again threatened by frenzied men and women with dire calamities to be visited upon myself and children because of what they saw fit to assert as my enmity to the Cuban cause.

"My position on all these questions was made perfectly clear in the official documents of the time, and there can be no possible mistake. It is very difficult for me to understand Senator Morgan's evidently wrong impressions in regard to my position. Indeed, it is one of the strangest things of these strange times that my position in these matters should be called into question."

Count Esterhazy, the retired French army officer who has been court-martialed on a charge of having had dealings with a foreign power detrimental to France, has fared better than Captain Dreyfus, whose case has created so much excitement in France. Esterhazy was acquitted at the end of a two days' trial, the decision of the court being unanimously in his favor. Both these cases illustrate one of the worst phases of militarism, namely, a narrow, sensitive, suspicious selfishness, which, on occasion, bursts out into tyrannical aggressiveness against both military men and civilians. There is a wide-spread feeling in France that Captain Dreyfus is an unjustly condemned man, and the demand has been strong and continued for a re-opening of his case. But so far all efforts to get a re-hearing for him have proved fruitless. His court-martial was in secret, and the French nation does not know to-day the real grounds of his condemnation. But the military authorities, or the national authorities under the terrible bondage of the military régime, have not dared to re-open the case or let the nation into the secret of the proceedings, lest it should be interpreted across the border as an act of weakness. The military régime knows no mercy, and justice itself is often trampled under foot by its iron-heeled discipline. Any citizen in the nation, however loyal and innocent, only has to have some suspicion of betraying military secrets raised against him by some public official or private adversary, and all his rights as a man and a citizen are at once imperilled, and, whether he be innocent or guilty, are liable to be lost forever through the swift decision of a secret trial. When race prejudice is mixed up with the matter, as in these cases in France, the evil is at its worst. Liberty practically has no meaning in a country where such a régime prevails.